HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVI, No. 24 Wednesday, June 17, 1959 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

SOUND DOLLAR: *A slogan for '60*.....(page 1)

SUPREME COURT: *A new trend?*.....(page 1)

TRUMAN: *Glasses still fogged*.....(page 2)

GOP: *Dinner brings home the bacon*.....(page 3)

LABOR: *The states act*.....(page 3)

Sound Dollar Crusade: The campaign for fiscal solvency, only a gallant hope last January, has gathered such momentum and grown to such proportions that "liberals" on Capitol Hill apprehensively regard it as a steamroller, reducing their chances for political victory in 1960.

Ike deserves credit, all agree, although no more credit than the battling conservative Republicans in Congress who alternately prodded and backed him, when "spending" bills came up before them. The Jeffersonian Democrats can also justifiably claim laurels, for their leader—Senator Harry F. Byrd of Virginia—last January called on Ike to head a "crusade" for sound money.

Last week's mammoth $100-a-plate dinner for Republicans in Congress spotlighted the power of this fast growing force for economy. It raked in over twice as much money as originally anticipated by the GOP legislators for the purpose of underwriting their efforts in re-election campaigns. The President and Vice President attended the function to pay tribute to the work of these toilers in the congressional vineyard.

The throng at the dinner wisecracked about Truman and Roosevelt. "Harry and FDR got us into debt and wouldn't balance the Budget. Never have so many owed so much—owing to the unsound fiscal policies of the New and Fair Deals." And in honor of the GOP members of Congress, whose ranks were decimated by last fall's elections: "Never has the GOP owed so much—to so few GOP Senators and Congressmen."

Observers commented that Ike is coining an irresistible slogan for this year and next by his emphasizing in almost every speech the necessity of maintaining a "sound dollar."

The "steamroller" rolls onward, and those at the dinner agreed that, for forensic purposes, the Republicans in next year's campaign should make their pitch an attack on the "won't do 86th Congress," dominated by Lyndon Johnson and Sam Rayburn. These "liberal" Democrats are not doing, and obviously won't do in the rest of the session, the necessary things to ensure a stable dollar, which the Administration has demanded of them. Veterans recall how effectively Harry Truman attacked (although quite unjustly) the 80th Congress and rode to victory in 1948 on the slogan "the do-nothing 80th Congress."

Already Senator Johnson has started to whine, so report prominent GOP Senators who converse with the Democratic leader on the floor. He complains to them about GOP House leaders Halleck and Richard Simpson, who have placed the blame on his shoulders for "doing nothing" and for blocking Presidential appointments like that of Strauss.

Whatever the forensics that make Capitol Hill ring these days, veteran observers believe that the Administration and conservatives (Republican and Democratic) in Congress have assumed a role and adopted a policy which spell victory. Many here recall the history of the period of the "Golden Years"—1897 to 1914. The parallel between then and now is striking.

The Republicans of that era successfully fought for two fundamental policies: (1) a sound dollar; and (2) genuinely free enterprise by breaking up monopolies (and "trusts"). They steamrollered Bryan and the "funny money" zealots and ensured a stable dollar; they did this so well, that by 1904, the Democratic candidate for President was constrained to say to his party: "The gold standard is irrevocable." On the other front—President Theodore Roosevelt, by vigorous prosecution of the Anti-Trust Act, effectively routed monopoly with ensuing prosperity and expansion.

Today—so it is argued—Budget balancing and holding the line against inflation will guarantee a return of the sound dollar. Also, legislative reform of the biggest monopoly of today—the power of the labor bosses—will strengthen the economy, thereby fortifying the currency, and will protect the individual worker. In short, after a quarter of a century of wandering in the wilderness of the New and Fair Deals, America will find herself. (Mark Sullivan, the political historian of the "Golden Years" epoch, entitled his volume on the period "America Finds Herself.")

Curbing the Court: The Supreme Court of the United States not only reads the election returns (to paraphrase Mr. Dooley); it also reads the *Congressional Record*, the daily repository of actions and debates of the two houses of Congress. So runs comment in the Senate and House press galleries. For the Court must have read the announcement that the House Rules Committee has reported the bill (H.R. 3) of Representative Howard W. Smith (D.-Va.) for early action on the floor of the House.

The Nine must have read this last—say cynical observers—because the following week, a majority of the Earl Warren Court began to backtrack on their policy of the past five years of "legislating" and overriding the power of the states (*vide* the desegregation and "soft on Communists" decisions).

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Congressman Smith's bill, members of Congress believe, will "curb the Court" and ensure the rights of the states. Last year, this measure passed the House by a thumping majority (composed not mostly of Southern Democrats but Northern conservative Republicans) and failed by only one vote of passing the Senate (due to devious maneuvering by Senate Leader Lyndon Johnson). Today the forces in Congress desirous of this reform are at it again, with high hopes.

Certainly, the Supreme Court Justices have become keenly aware of the growing volume of protest across the country against its "legislative" policy, especially in its "soft on Communism" decisions. Well informed sources on Capitol Hill (where the Court building is located) cite, as an example of Court sensitivity on this matter, the story about what happened to one of the Justice's secretaries, who asked for a month's vacation to take a tour of Russia.

She was informed by her boss that under no condition would she be allowed to take a vacation in the "Red paradise," and she was told why: in view of the rising tide of criticism of the Court for its "let the Reds off" policy, this was no time for anybody connected with the Court to take such a trip.

Thus, insiders expressed no great surprise that the Court, by a 5 to 4 vote, upheld a New Hampshire court in convicting Dr. Willard Uphaus for refusing to give the state's Attorney General information. Dr. Uphaus would not let the state see a guest list of a summer camp which he operated. Similarly, the Court decided against a teacher, in another case, who refused to answer a question put by a congressional committee and was convicted of contempt of Congress. Justice Black, invariably on the side of such defendants, vocally mourned that the latter decision marked another "retreat" from the safeguards of the First Amendment to the Constitution.

Despite the "retreat" of the Court on these cases, members of the House are not lulled into inaction, remarked Representative William M. Tuck (D.-Va.), one of the leaders in the battle to pass Smith's bill. These actions by the Nine, says Tuck, "do not diminish in the slightest our efforts to push through Smith's measure. House members are not so naive as to be fooled by these decisions. H.R. 3 is going to be passed by the House." Observers think Tuck's estimate is correct.

It is believed that, while more opposition to passage is expected from the "liberals" whose ranks have increased as a result of last fall's elections, more pressure for passage is coming from the conservatives. It is noted that business elements (alerted by "liberal" victories last fall) are rallying more strongly in favor of Smith's "curb the Court" bill than last year. The NAM (National Association of Manufacturers) *News* of June 5 came out vigorously in support of the measure. Business interests naturally understand that the bill will not only give the states more power in handling subversives but also will permit them to deal better with many labor abuses.

Truman: Washingtonians recently caught a faint, curious echo of the era of the Truman scandals, when the Washington bureau of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* reported (June 3) that "former President Harry S. Truman will be the principal speaker at a $100-a-plate testimonial dinner for Matthew J. Connelly, Truman's appointments secretary when he was in the White House."

The St. Louis paper said the event, which will be held September 19 in Boston, is intended to raise a legal defense fund for Connelly. He and T. Lamar Caudle, another Truman aide, were convicted in June, 1956, on charges of conspiring to defraud the Government of their services by attempting to delay the prosecution of Irving Sachs, St. Louis head of Shu-Stiles, Inc., on a Federal income tax evasion charge (The *Post-Dispatch* refers to it as "an alleged tax-fixing case.")

Connelly and Caudle were sentenced to serve two years in prison and fined $2,500; but are free on bond pending dispositions of appeals. The Supreme Court twice, in 1958, refused to review the cases.

An appeal for a new trial, on the ground that evidence used against them had been repudiated, is pending.

The Capital finds the dinner title "testimonial" rather curious. It is asked: "Testimonial—for what?" However, no surprise is registered that Mr. Truman should agree to serve as Honorary Chairman of the function and to give a speech. For Truman, as the *Post-Dispatch* remarks, is "noted for his loyalty to persons loyal to him." It is recalled that when his political mentor, Boss Pendergast of Kansas City, was sent to jail for income tax evasion, Truman expressed sorrow and did not repudiate him.

Nixon and World Court: Vice President Nixon's apparent inclination to subordinate American sovereignty to a World Court, by talking of "modifying" the Connally Amendment of 1946, has aroused not only conservatives but also "liberals" among leaders of his party. Former Governor Alfred M. Landon (GOP presidential candidate in 1936) in a recent speech expressed his concern about the tone of the Vice President's remarks. In recent years, Landon (who in 1936 was a conservative) has espoused "liberal" policies and is now classified as a "Modern Republican."

Although Nixon's language remains somewhat equivocal, he left the impression that he wished to repeal the Connally Amendment of 1946, which in effect reserves for the US Government the right to determine which cases it will submit to, what is generally called, the World Court. The Connally Amendment specifies that disputes regarding domestic matters should remain within the jurisdiction of the US courts; and that the US alone should decide what is "domestic" and what is "international."

Governor Landon raises the question as to whether Nixon was speaking for himself, or was "loyally speaking only for the Administration." He points out that Nixon used the word "re-examine" as well as "modify" the Connally Amendment. "I am," said Landon, "all for that 're-examine.'"

Re-examining the issue, Landon points out that Nixon speaks of a "wider jurisdiction" of the World Court: "Countless people through the ages have dreamed of a world living under a rule of law, equity and justice

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in international affairs. I think the free world has the degree of maturity that would enable it to comply with an independent court's decisions, but in view of their record, the Communist countries would not—unless it suited their avowed purpose of world conquest."

And the former GOP candidate for President renders a verdict: "Until there is basic change of that [Communist] policy, I don't believe the free world can look for too much from an expanded jurisdiction of the World Court—either geographically or by removing statutory limitations."

Rebuilding the GOP: The $100-a-plate dinner, held last week, raised a war chest of about $325,000 after payment of expenses. This amount in the treasury has brought rejoicing, because in recent years the GOP Congressional Committee (for House members) and the Senatorial Campaign Committee have had to operate with only about two weeks' funds in the kitty in advance. Now a stretch of clear water lies ahead.

This new method of ensuring funds for these two groups is, in part, designed to free the members of Congress from dependence on the Republican National Committee, which traditionally is under the thumb of the White House. GOP congressional leaders, on the morrow of the successful money raising banquet, note a rise in morale of the rank-and-file members and a greater show of independence. Now they can vote and speak their minds more freely. More talk is current of the previously reported plan for issuing a statement of GOP principles and policies by these two congressional campaign committees. Since the GOP Presidential nominee —whoever he may be—to be successful, will have to run on the record established during the present session of Congress, such a statement assumes great importance. The revolution, in the relations between the party in Congress and the party in the White House, appears to be underway.

Although the success of the fund-raising effort has boosted morale, rejoicing is modified by the fact that this money—$325,000—will underwrite the operations of the GOP House and Senate campaign committees only until January 1, 1960. There is talk of other regional and local money raising efforts for the two groups.

The point is made that the dinner last week brought the congressional Republicans closer to the people in the constituencies who contributed so handsomely. It is felt that wider results might come from bringing the liaison ever closer by holding dinners in certain key cities (perhaps Los Angeles, San Francisco, Dallas, Boston, and New York) at $50-a-plate. The harvest might well prove of such magnitude that the Republican members of Congress would be assured of sufficient funds to last through the election of November, 1960.

New Deal: One of the senatorial hopefuls in the Democratic Presidential nomination race symbolizes his campaign by pressing for revival of one of the most notorious measures of the New Deal days. A Senate labor subcommittee last week approved a bill introduced by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D.-Minn.) that would, for all practical purposes, re-establish the highly controversial Civilian Conservation Corps which flourished in the 'thirties under Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Humphrey would call this welfare state organization the Youth Conservation Corps. It would fall under control of the Department of Labor and provide jobs on Federal conservation projects for 150,000 young men between the ages of 16 and 21, for which they would receive $60 to $90 a month, plus housing and food. The alleged purpose of the bill is to combat delinquency by taking unemployed youths off the streets and giving them healthy outdoor work.

The Administration is opposed to the bill, particularly during this period of high employment, because it says the Nation can't afford its price tag that would run into hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

The Omaha *Evening World-Herald* opposes the plan on fundamental grounds:

"In a free land, the Government has no business trying to 'tide over' young people 'through a period of strife.' Governmentally brainwashed 'youth corps' are the hallmarks of dictatorships . . . the Federal Government has no mission, now or ever, to relieve unemployment by enlarging the Government payroll. . . . "

Capitol Camera: Senator Wayne Morse (D.-Ore.), former college professor and now a controversial figure in the confused Senate picture on Presidential appointment confirmations, prides himself on his erudition. For instance, in the cloakrooms they refer to him as "Vain" Morse. At the recent preliminary hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the nomination of John M. Cabot as Ambassador to Brazil, Morse had his colleagues scratching their heads when he asked Cabot if he spoke Spanish. Other committee members knew that the native tongue of Brazil is Portuguese.

● Representative William E. Minshall (R.-Ohio) has come up with a simple but impressive yardstick by which the astounding size of our national debt can be illustrated. "One million dollars," Minshall says, "is a stack of one thousand dollar bills approximately four inches high; one billion is a stack of bills 333 feet high." By this yardstick, in order to pay back the current national debt, Uncle Sam would need a stack of one thousand dollar bills more than 18 miles high!

Labor Front: While Congress procrastinates on what type of labor reform bill, if any, will come out of the current session, a number of states are going ahead with reform measures of their own. Syndicated columnist John Herling, writing for the Washington *News*, reports this run-down on state labor reform legislation:

(1) New York has put into effect a new law containing provisions similar to those in the original Kennedy-Ervin "sweetheart" bill. California has a comparable measure pending.

(2) In New Mexico, the legislators acted squarely on the basis of the McClellan committee revelations and came up with strong reforms, including the restriction of certain types of picketing.

(3) Nebraska passed a law making secondary boycotting a crime, the violation of which is punishable by a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fine, imprisonment or both. In North Dakota, felons are now barred from holding a union office.

Not all of the labor reform news from individual states is on the plus side. Oregon, for example, bucked the growing trend and repealed a standing labor relations law, thus eliminating certain picketing restrictions previously on the books. In Illinois, the House knuckled under to demands of union lobbyists and voted down (93-63) a bill that would have outlawed "racket" picketing.

In commenting on the defeat of the Illinois measure, the *Chicago Tribune*, in effect, served a warning to the entire Nation: "For the labor lobby to oppose legislation aimed at so palpable an abuse is the ultimate in arrogance. It would be incredible if it were not true.

"If the labor bosses can carry the Illinois House for racket picketing, and by a margin of 30 votes, then the present House and the present Democratic party in this state will give the labor lobby anything it wants, at whatever sacrifice to the public welfare."

Education: Backers of the Democratic-sponsored $4.4 billion Murray-Metcalf Federal aid to education bill claim that this program will equalize educational opportunities in America. They cite the differences among the individual states in money spent on teachers' salaries and school construction as proof that Federal aid is necessary.

Representative Frank T. Bow (R.-Ohio) points out that these dollar comparisons "can be very misleading" and that the current Federal aid to education bill would actually increase the present disparity among the states.

"The cost of living in a rural Georgia community is far lower than in New York City," Congressman Bow says. "To pay Georgia teachers at New York rates would make them the wealthiest people in town, and that is neither justified nor likely to happen. It costs less to build in Alabama than in Ohio, and there is no reason to require Alabama to spend at Ohio levels."

Bow points out that the new "giveaway" scheme proposes that each state receive $25 in Federal aid for each child in the 6-17 age group, to supplement funds appropriated at state and local levels. "New York now spends $535 per year for each child enrolled in public schools," the Ohioan says. "Georgia spends $208." Under the current Federal aid measure, New York would be able to spend $560 per pupil and Georgia $234. "Where is the equalization in that proposal?" Bow asks.

And the Congressman concludes: "Whether one favors Federal aid to education or not, it seems to me that the pending measure falls far short of accomplishing any purpose other than the general distribution of funds we do not have."

● The Murray-Metcalf bill has come under sharp attack from other sources in recent weeks—one a longtime proponent of Federal aid to education. An editorial in a recent edition of *America*, the Jesuit weekly, stated: "In recent years we have consistently favored bills for temporary Federal aid, designed to assist the states in meeting specific needs in education. However, the weaknesses and the implications of this bill leave us no alternative but to declare our opposition to it."

The editorial declared that the "necessity for outright grants of Federal money to overcome the classroom shortage is far from obvious. The states are building 70,000 classrooms each year without Federal aid. Many communities, if they are not already caught up, are rapidly doing so."

● Speaking before a Rutgers University alumni dinner recently, advertising executive Charles H. Brower made this incisive comment on the state of "liberal" education in America: "Why should we spend all of our money educating youngsters who are so bright that they know there is no God, that life is just 60 or 70 years of idiocy, that love is a mere biological mess, that patriotism is corny and that altogether it's really too futile to try? I'd rather put my money into educating a few men and women who are too dumb to know they are already licked before they start."

Co-ops: A high-handed order to force telephone users into a co-operative comes to light from Indiana. The case involves the Pulaski-White Co-op which bought out three small telephone exchanges—with the aid of $425,997 borrowed from the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington—and then proceeded to demand a $20 initiation fee from each of the previous owners' customers.

A number of the old customers refused to join the co-op, even when given a "join or else" [no service] ultimatum.

The Indiana State Public Service Commission ruled last week that a utility co-op cannot demand membership from all of the people it serves, particularly those who had been serviced by previous non-co-op owners.

The commission's ruling stated: (1) that telephone co-ops may give service to non-members up to 30 per cent of the membership, if the 30 per cent were formerly served by exchanges bought out by the co-ops, and (2) that the co-ops must give non-members rates that will not discriminate against them.

HUMAN EVENTS SCORES WITH STUDENTS

DENNIS A. HEWITT, Miami University of Ohio: "HUMAN EVENTS provides me, in many cases, with a 'side' of the news that I would not be able to get otherwise . . . Thus, to me, HUMAN EVENTS has become 'must' reading each week."

WILLIAM J. MANLEY, President of Young Republican Club, Oklahoma State University: "In view of my activities and interests in the political scene, HUMAN EVENTS has proven one of the finest publications I have ever read."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In lots of 5000 $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year; airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.

For change of address send old address (exactly as it appears on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1957, and 1958 volumes available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., SE, Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1959.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*
JOHN R. BENEDICT, *Assistant Editor* NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, *Assistant Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVI, No. 24 HUMAN EVENTS June 17, 1959
Article Section

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Textile Union Strikes Out in Dixie

How Violence Backfires at Henderson, North Carolina

By JAMES CLAY

"HAVING BEEN a college professor, and now a minister, I am a 'liberal,' as you might expect. I've always been very sympathetic to the aims and activities of organized labor. But now that I've seen them in action, my views have changed." The speaker was a young Protestant clergyman whose congregation includes several union-member, mill-worker families, other lower middle income families, a few small retail store owners and managers, but not one person even remotely connected with big business or the management of the Harriet & Henderson Cotton Mills at Henderson, N. C.

"I went to a regional conference a couple of weeks ago," he continued, "and my fellow ministers asked, 'What are you doing for those poor union people up in Henderson?' I tried to explain, but soon gave it up. I couldn't make them understand. YOU'VE GOT TO SEE IT TO KNOW."

The strike of the Textile Workers Union of America at the Henderson cotton mills moves toward its eighth month. At the beginning, an undetermined number of the factories' 921 production workers met in a Henderson tobacco warehouse and went along with their leaders' strike ultimatum, by voice vote. TWUA strike-boss Boyd Payton says 900 were present and the vote was unanimous. Some say about 400 were present, that it was a madhouse of noise and confusion, and that the majority of those on hand didn't know what it was all about. Chances are the truth lies somewhere between those two versions, but when the shouting was over, President John D. Cooper, Jr., of the Harriet-Henderson Cotton Mills had a strike on his hands.

On Friday, November 14, 1958, at the afternoon shift change, the workers inside the mills walked out. The following Monday a mass of picketers filled the streets and barred the gates, chanting the peculiar Americanized Marxian language of much of American trade unionism and carrying signs bearing well lettered slogans such as: SOLIDARITY, UNITED WE STAND, and one especially significant and symbolic masterpiece that read:

Jesus Leads Us
The Union Feeds Us
John D. Needs Us

To all of Henderson, "John D." means only John D. Cooper, Jr., of Harriet-Henderson.

Here in the "Bible Belt" of the upper South there are numerous religious sects. Week-long revival services flourish and faith-healers advertise with printed circulars and radio spot announcements. But the great majority of the people, from mill hands to mill owners, are deeply and sincerely religious, and practice Christianity as members of orthodox Protestant churches; Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopal and others—probably in that order. The town of Henderson and surrounding Vance County have about as many churches per capita as any area of the United States.

TWUA leaders have carefully exploited the deep religious impulses of the cotton mill workers. At union meetings and in daily radio broadcasts they make use of prayers and hymns for openings, closings, and background. Union spokesmen pronounce "the gospel of unionism." On several occasions TWUA Vice President Boyd Payton said, "Christ and the twelve Disciples were the first union." He quotes the Sermon on the Mount, adding, "If you love thy neighbor as thyself, you won't go back to work." And he told this reporter, "The TWUA has the same objectives and principles as Christianity."

No doubt this tactic—tying union and religion into one neat package—paid dividends during the pre-strike period and in the early weeks following the walkout. But it's beginning to wear thin with the jobless strikers and has contributed to a strong anti-union sentiment among the townspeople. One striker said, "I'm starting to think Boyd Payton should have been a preacher and let somebody else run the union." And, led by local ministers, Henderson citizens deeply resent what they consider patent misapplication of Christianity, the religion they love and cherish.

Pastor David Guthrie of St. John's Episcopal Church felt constrained to write a personal letter to Boyd Payton, outlining his objections "to the use of a religion as a means of promoting the union's immediate ends . . . I resent and resist . . . the union falls far short of Christianity in the use of force, threats, and violence by union members."

Published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1959 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Payton cheerfully publicized this personal protest in his next radio broadcast, quoting and commenting on selected parts of it, and taking the occasion to confide his youthful ambition to become a minister.

The causes of the strike have been obscured by time and some 92 proposals and counter-proposals between September 6, 1958, when the company notified the union that it wished to make some changes in their contract, and April 24, 1959, when the union wired its disavowal of an agreement engineered by North Carolina's Governor Luther Hodges. Most reporters have boiled it down to the arbitration clause of the old contract, but there is much more to it than that.

The real crux of the issue was a gradual increase in wage rates, forced by the relentless pressure of union power, implemented by slow-downs, lack of cooperation on work schedules, and excessive absenteeism, and backed by the arbitration clause which, for practical purposes, was merely a union tool. The arbiters, judging by the records of the cases arbitrated, invariably decided against the company in the key cases—those involving the discharge of employees for excessive absenteeism, insubordination in resisting temporary job transfers necessitated by production requirements, and one employee advising and coercing another to slow down production.

The adverse decisions in these key cases resulted in constant wage boosts, higher production costs, and weakened Harriet-Henderson's competitive position in the industry.

The company, with wages averaging about 15¢ higher than in comparable industries, saw three alternatives. It could liquidate immediately. It could continue the contract with TWUA as it was, and face forced liquidation three or four years hence. Or it could try to negotiate a new contract eliminating the arbitration clause. The latter course was chosen.

Following management's initial move (the letter of September 6), the union submitted counter-proposals, but in the meantime let it be known that it wanted to renew the old contract. Apparently the counter-proposals were intended only to strengthen the union leaders' bargaining position. Company President John D. Cooper, Jr., said "They were itching for a strike. They notified me five weeks before the contract expired that they would accept no changes at all. I'd already told them we had to have some changes, but hadn't specified what changes." After the strike began, the TWUA turned down management's offer to operate under a special temporary arrangement for 60 days while negotiations continued.

If, as it might be surmised, the TWUA was spoiling for a strike to advertise its organizational drive in the South, or for whatever purpose, the union bosses must now sorely regret their strategy. The strike is lost and they know it.

After the walkout on November 17, 1958, the mills shut down completely. Negotiations did continue, but each conference only served to illustrate the tremendous gap separating the TWUA and Harriet-Henderson. Management insisted the arbitration clause must go; the union would settle for no less than continuation of the old agreement. The chances of quick settlement faded and both sides prepared for a long siege.

Morale of the striking workers was high at the beginning. The union was "feeding" them and Cooper certainly needed them, as he watched $8 million worth of the newest and best cotton mill machinery deteriorate in idleness, and saw his customers going to competitors. The TWUA locals issued "grocery cards" and distributed food on the basis of size of family. In addition, some of the strikers presented union checks in payment of pressing debts such as home mortgages and installment notes on autos or appliances.

BUT OTHERS had to depend on sympathetic merchants or bankers to extend credit. Administration of the strike funds was handled by committees of union members, and despite apparent inequities and some quiet grumbling, there was no open dissension.

In early February, John D. Cooper, Jr., and the several young executives who make up the management of the cotton mills began to consider the possibility of re-opening, with or without the striking workers. It was then Cooper suggested to TWUA strike-boss Payton that the workers come back for 60 days under the temporary arrangement while negotiations were continued. The union rejected this truce proposal.

The company put out quiet feelers to determine two factors: (1) how many of the strikers would come back if given the opportunity and (2) how much supplementary labor, if any, was available. Cooper concluded that two-thirds of the strikers would welcome the chance to return and that "some" additional labor could be recruited from the surrounding countryside. On February 12 an advertisement was placed in the Henderson *Daily Dispatch* inviting all employees of Harriet-Henderson to return to work. A copy of the ad was mailed to each employee. On February 16 the mill gates opened, and the violence began.

"I've got a wife and a boy and another one on the way. I couldn't live on union hand-outs. I got to have cash money in the house. I just picked up my dinner bucket and went to work." That is how the decision to return to his job was made by one young mill worker. That evening a committee of continuing strikers visited his home.

"They talked, one after another, for about an hour. As soon as they left another bunch came in. They'd been waiting down the street in a car. They did all the talking—I just said I had to work.

"The next day my wife got some phone calls. Some of them said, 'He better not go back tomorrow.' Others yelled, 'Scab! Scab! Scab!' and hung

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

up. When I got home I got some calls. Sometimes when I picked it up there was just quiet—they didn't say nothing. One of them said, 'Don't let your boy get in the street, he might get run over.'

"NEXT NIGHT I was watching TV and my wife was already in bed. There was a big blast out front and the whole house shook. I went out. The porch was blowed to kindling wood. I wasn't scared, but I had to think of my wife and the boy. I called the mill and told them I wasn't coming in no more."

As of May 26, 109 employees who went out with the strike had returned to work, and stuck it out through almost unbelievable intimidation, threats, assault, abuse, rock-throwings, dynamiting, and other coercive acts by the strikers. Of the remaining employees who struck, a great many had indicated their willingness to come back. Some had returned for a day or two, as in the case described above. Others had appeared at the mill gates only to be turned back by oral or physical abuse. Still others had confided their desires and fears of returning to friends.

When it was announced that new employees would be hired to replace those strikers who would not return to the mills, Harriet-Henderson employment offices were swamped with applicants who braved the threats and violence of the picket lines. Most of them came from outside Henderson, from rural communities within a radius of about 25 miles. A great many were farmers who had neither enough income to live on, nor enough work to keep busy, under severely restricted tobacco or cotton acreage limitations imposed by the Federal Government.

"I heard they were hiring so I came in," is the way many of these hard-bitten farmers or their women express their motivation. They had no union or strike sentiment, one way or the other. They live alone in the country and are not subject to the concentrated social pressures of city-dwelling union members, and they couldn't care less about Boyd Payton's "gospel of unionism." In addition to these part-time farm folks, many young men and women just out of school came for work.

Cooper, supplementing returning strikers with labor from this reservoir, quickly filled out his first shift, which became a training camp for the new, inexperienced mill hands.

PRODUCTION was slow, but the new workers learned rapidly. Called "farmers and misfits" by TWUA leaders, they actually represented a higher average educational level than those they replaced. So production picked up and "John D." began planning to start up his second shift. Negotiations went on, with a single new development. Governor Luther Hodges entered the talks as a mediator.

Governor Hodges is a former textile manufacturer. Judged to be a Democratic vice presidential candidate by some politically wise North Carolinians, he has focused the attention of his Administration on getting new industry for his state. The TWUA's Harriet-Henderson strike, with all its violence and the resultant nation-wide publicity, hasn't contributed to either ambition. It is understandable that he would attempt to settle it. Using the prestige of his office and his own persuasive personality, he negotiated a compromise that was announced on April 17, three days before the second shift was scheduled to resume. Henderson was jubilant, but not for long.

From the day of the first newspaper advertisement in which the striking employees were invited to return to the mills, the company emphasized the necessity of hiring replacements for those who did not choose to come back. The mills could not be operated profitably without three full shifts running. The company repeatedly advertised the fact that new employees would be considered permanent, subject only to the usual personnel standards and their individual ability to learn and perform on the job.

On the day of the Hodges compromise, about 700 workers, including both returned strikers and the newly hired, passed through the gates. The TWUA knew these figures for they had conducted gate counts several times, and the figures had been accurately quoted in radio reports. Management gave assurances that every effort would be made to work the old employees back into the mills, without prejudice. But apparently the union kept its members in the dark, for when they reported for work as a result of the agreement and found that some of their old jobs were no longer open, the uneasy compromise blew to bedlam.

Beginning at once and continuing through days and nights to follow, rifle bullets sang through the mill community. Dynamite explosions rocked homes of workers and mill officials alike. Gun fire raked carloads of mill employees going to and from their jobs. Homemade gasoline bombs flashed and flamed on the mill grounds and in the streets. Several people were injured. Miraculously, no one was killed.

A SEMBLANCE of order was restored through the joint efforts of town, county, and state law enforcement agencies, including 300 troopers of the North Carolina National Guard. Hundreds of cases of personal assault or property damage were reported and investigated, resulting in about 200 arrests. The Superior Court of Vance County extended its regular session from two to five weeks to hear all the cases. There had been 43 convictions by the end of last month, with sentences ranging from payment of one-half of court costs, to 25 months in jail for one multiple offender.

Henderson is quiet today. Court restrained picketers patrol the mill gates in silence at shift changes. The National Guard citizen-soldiers stand by to assure the safe passage of employees to and from the plants. Ex-strikers now back on the job still get ominous telephone calls and one or two drop

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out every week to rejoin the strikers, but other strikers come in to take their places. The new employees are generally out of reach of the union forces by reason of place of residence, and they carefully avoid the places where strikers congregate. Carloads of job seekers still come in from the countryside, but only a handful of openings remain.

Except for the militant minority who manage union affairs and man the picket lines, the strikers are heartbroken and hopeless. A sizeable number have found new jobs, and others are looking.

The TWUA, supported by other AFL-CIO affiliates and a National Citizens Committee for Henderson Freedom Fighters Support, is spending about $25,000 a week in Henderson. Most of this goes for subsidizing strikers and their families. Some of it goes for pure propaganda designed to sustain the morale of the strikers, and to influence public opinion.

Henderson businessmen are slowly recovering from the five months' loss of a $60,000 weekly payroll, which is now back up to nearly $50,000. Those who have outstanding and overdue accounts among the strikers are beginning to insist on payment or repossession. Eight new industries have begun operating in Henderson during the past year. They now employ between 450 and 500 people, with potential employment of 1100 within five years.

The TWUA is taking it on the chin in North Carolina. Public opinion has turned sharply against it. Mayor Carroll V. Singleton went on the radio May 27 and publicly invited Boyd Payton to leave Henderson. In neighboring Roanoke Rapids, where the TWUA has spent years trying to organize the four textile plants of the J. P. Stevens Company, the eligible employees voted 2-to-1 against the union in a National Labor Relations Board supervised election. The election took place in April, when union violence was at its climax in Henderson.

The attitude of present employees of Harriet-Henderson was expressed to this writer in unmistakable terms. They want no more of the TWUA. One young lady who went out with the strike but later returned, said vehemently: *"I'll never join a union again—unless North Carolina repeals the Right-to-Work law—then I'd have to. But as long as the state allows free labor, I'll take my chances with old John D."*

James Clay is an assistant to Representative Edgar W. Hiestand (R.-Calif.). A specialist on labor matters, this article is his first contribution to HUMAN EVENTS. Clay recently visited Henderson to make a first hand study of the strike.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ARTICLE REPRINTS STILL AVAILABLE

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C.

(Number of Copies)

Textile Union Strikes Out in Dixie . . . . . by James Clay

A $52 Billion Bundle of Inflation . . . . . by Roger M. Blough—*A US Steel executive exposes fallacies in arguments of Steelworkers Union for higher wages.*

Featherbedding: Robbery Made Legal . . . . . by Frank Chodorov—*How the shakedown of employers creates unemployment for those who practice it.*

New York's Newspaper Blackout . . . . . by Fred J. Cook—*The inside story of a strike that throttled our biggest city.*

Violence: How the Teamsters Union Terrorizes Small Business . . . . . .

The Right to Work . . . . . by the Rev. John C. Coogan

How to Beat the Labor Bosses . . . . . by James L. Wick—*Missouri business leaders prove it can be done.*

The Union Bosses Speak . . . . . *Their goals and how they expect to obtain them.*

Breaking the Wage-Price Spiral . . . . . by William A. McDonnell

Single copies 20c; 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30; in 5,000 lots, $25 per thousand. Add up the number ordered to determine total price.

Enter my order for a 5 weeks TRIAL subscription to HUMAN EVENTS for $1 ☐. One year subscription $11 ☐.

Payment enclosed ..... Bill me .....

Name .....

Address .....
(Number) (Street)

.....
(City) (Zone) (State)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED